UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,889	08/20/2003	Michael P. Coppert	IGT1P319/AC00046-001	8185
	7590 11/02/200 Villeneuve & Sampson	EXAMINER		
Attn: IGT P.O. Box 70250 Oakland, CA 94612-0250			VU, TUAN A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2193	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/02/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO@wavsip.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No. Ap		Applicant(s)	
	10/645,889	COPPERT, MICHAEL P.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TUAN A. VU	2193	

Application No.

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 13 October 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☑ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for
appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: <u>The argument regarding Vuong not teaching a plurality of filters relates to the rationale set forth in claim 10, where each station in Vuong provide a capability (or wager software) to assess when a particular metric is reached, leading to a alert; hence has evidenced a test implicating a plurality of values filtering functions, each associated with a metric threshold.</u>
The argument does not seem to show how Vuong's teaching when combined with Crado would teach away from each endeavors of Vuong and Crado. Argument that Vuong fails to determine comparing a value against a range does not take into effect the interpretation that assessing whether a threshold is reached would be similar to comparing a given value to a range thereof. Argument that "alarm point" was not taught in Vuong appears to add additional limitation into the claim
language. Regarding the tester's filter that defines a range, both Crado and Vuong teach a capability to determine whether a value has reached a threshold, such capabilty being founded on rules based on range and a threshold not to exceed. The language of 'defining a range' is deemed fulfilled by that capabilty. The Amendments as proposed would not simplify effect of a Appeal; hence would only complicate the state of the prosecution; hence will not be specially when the
outstanding Office Action does not seem to be overcome by the above arguments. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☑ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed:
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>8,10-18,24,25,27-33,39,40 and 42-48</u> .
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

/Tuan A Vu/ Examiner, Art Unit 2193

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 20091026